

Serial No. 09/884,231

Filed: June 19, 2001

REMARKS

Claims 28-33 and 44-69 are pending in the present application. Claim 28 has been amended to clarify features already present in Claim 28. Claims 29-32 were amended to maintain antecedent basis with Claim 28. Claims 44-45 are similar to Claims 42-43 which were indicated as part of Species D in the restriction requirement mailed on July 27, 2004. Claims 47-69 have been added to claim features present in the application and claims. Independent Claim 47 is similar to cancelled Claim 1 and is therefore generic to elected species D. Independent Claims 56 and 65 are directed to Species D. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 28-33 and examination on the merits of Claims 44-69 in view of the following remarks.

Telephonic Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview conducted on May 9, 2005. Applicant further thanks the Examiner for the indication that the present amendments to Claim 28 overcome the prior art cited in the previous office action.

Claim Rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Pending Claims 28, 30 and 31 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication JP 5-85196 (hereinafter referred to as "JP '196"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because the cited prior art does not teach all of the limitations of the Claims.

Amended Claim 28 is directed to a method of making a woven spider. The method includes weaving a selected non-conducting thread that is wrapped with an electrical conductor

Serial No. 09/884,231

Filed: June 19, 2001

into a woven cloth to form a single shed or course of the woven cloth that forms the woven spider. As discussed during the telephonic interview, JP '196 fails to teach helically wrapping an electrical conductor around a non-conducting thread as described in Claim 28.

Claim Rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 28, 30, 31 and 32 also stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of JP '196 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,091,958 to Sakamoto et al. (herein after referred to as Sakamoto). In addition, Claim 29 is rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of JP '196, Sakamoto and EP '434. Further, Claim 33 stands rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of JP '196, Sakamoto and U.S. Patent No. 3,841,952 to Kimura et al. (hereafter "Kimura"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because the cited prior art does not teach all of the limitations of the pending Claims.

As was discussed during the telephonic interview, JP '196 does not teach helically wrapping an electrical conductor around a selected non-conducting thread as described in Claim 28. In the office action, it has been asserted that Sakamoto teaches these limitations. However, in Col. 3 lines 3-6, Sakamoto teaches "two tinsel cords woven flat and serving as conductors 2 are sewn in parallel into the damper raw material."

As was discussed during the interview, Sakamoto fails to teach, suggest, or disclose helically wrapping an electrical conductor around a selected non-conducting thread as described in Claim 28. In addition, as depicted in Figures 1, 2A, 3, 6 and 9-15 the conductors (2) of Sakamoto are clearly mounted on top of the damper (1) similar to EP '434 and as described in the

Serial No. 09/884,231

Filed: June 19, 2001

background section of Applicant's specification, not woven into a woven cloth to form a single shed or course of the woven cloth as described in Claim 28.

For at least the foregoing reasons, all of the claim features provided in Claim 28 are not taught or suggested by the cited prior art either alone or in combination. In addition, Claims 29-33 depend from independent Claim 28 and are not taught, suggested, or disclosed by the cited prior art for at least the same reasons. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 28-33.

None of the cited prior art teaches, suggests or discloses the limitations described in Claims 44-69. Applicant believes that present claims are allowable in their present form and that this application is in condition for allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner so find and issue a Notice of Allowance in due course. Should the Examiner deem a telephone conference to be beneficial in expediting examination and/or allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Sanders N. Hillis
Attorney Reg. No. 45,712

SNH/bal

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
CUSTOMER NO. 27879
Telephone: (317) 636-0886
Fax: (317) 634-6701